and the meddling of foreign science, others advocated a new orthography, in the name of science and education, which effectively hid the degree to which Tagalog was already a language contaminated by Spanish words.

In comparison with ethnology and folklore, the science of philology (or linguistics) became entangled in, and a subject of, a political battle fought on multiple fronts. Like folklore, linguistic science was a tool in reconstructing a pre-Hispanic past, but it was also a source of data, and even more particularly a method, for looking toward future progress in the Philippines. The future of the Philippines was also a subject of illustrado writings about the history of Spanish colonization in the Philippines. In the following chapter, we will see how these works gestured toward possible futures for the Philippines, using the data and methods of linguistics, ethnology, and folklore to challenge Spanish colonial history.

**Lessons in History**

The Decline of Spanish Rule, and Revolutionary Strategy

In 1885, the Spanish government commissioned a painting from Juan Luna, a young Ilocano who had won prizes for earlier canvases in major competitions. The result, *Paso de sangre* (Blood Compact), depicted what was understood to be the founding moment of Spanish sovereignty in the Philippines, in which the indigenous ruler Sikatuna and the Spaniard Miguel López de Legazpi sealed their pledge to mutual aid by ceremonially drinking each other's blood. The painting shows Legazpi in the center (flanked by others of his party), looking at Sikatuna, whose hand holds the raised glass of ceremonial drink, but who faces away from the viewer inviting speculation about his facial expression. Luna's Blood Compact is one of many *ilustrado* representations of the subject. Spanish histories took the event to be the glorious inauguration of Spanish sovereignty and tutelage in the islands, and symbolic of the legal basis and moral legitimacy of Spanish rule—moral because won by goodwill and cooperation.1 *Ilustrado* also cited the blood compact as a founding moment of Spanish sovereignty, but instead of emphasizing a connection between Legazpi and the current institutions of the state, they noted difference. *La solidaridad*, for example, called the Blood Compact the "sole legal historical foundation of the Spanish intervention in the Government of the Archipelago of that era," challenging the legality of any Spanish sovereignty that exceeded the terms of that particular contract.3 José Rizal also used the blood compact to question the strength of Spain's power, noting that to call that early era of Spanish presence "the conquest" inaccurately suggested that Spain overpowered local people and institutions. Writing in his annotations to an early seventeenth-century Spanish account, Rizal deemed that "conquest can only be accepted for a few islands and only in a very broad sense. Cebu [Señor], Panay, Leyte [Laoza], Mindoro, etc., can not be called conquered"
because they were acquired "by way of pacts, treaties of friendship, and reciprocal alliances," arrangements that by definition suggest two parties of equal status and legitimacy if not power. To stress the reciprocal nature of the agreements, and thus the equivalence between the signatories, Rizal noted that "Legazpi's soldiers fought under Tupas, the ruler ['reyeudo'] of Cebu," an arrangement that indicated mutual trust and recognition between Legazpi and the Cebuano sovereign.  

In his hands, then, the blood compact became symbolic not as the foundation of a valid and moral Spanish sovereignty that lived forever after but as a moment of contract between equals in which the sovereignty of the Spanish crown depended on the assent of the indigenous rulers. The blood compact symbolized the status and sovereignty of the islands' natives, and their recognition by early Spanish emissaries. Sikatana was the sovereign who had conferred some privileges and responsibilities upon Legazpi and so, by extension, upon the Spanish crown. By implication, those privileges could be revoked should Legazpi or the crown fail to fulfill their obligations.

Legazpi's blood compact with Sikatana was a particularly potent symbol, but it was one of many events documented by Spanish histories of the Philippines that illustrated and propagandist authors reevaluated. Such historical moments were, as we might expect, ripe for reinterpretation and rewriting in the politicized scholarly writings of propagandists. Elsewhere we have explored the ways that Isabelo de los Reyes, T. H. Pardo de Tavera, Pedro Paterno, and Rizal represent the pre-Hispanic "prehistory" of the Philippines, or its peoples at the moment of first contact. In this chapter, we will consider how de los Reyes, in his Historia de Ilocos, and Rizal, in his notes to the 1609 account of the Spaniard Mora, represented the period of Philippine history that commenced with the arrival of the Spanish.  

As scholars have already shown, these authors read earlier versions of the Spanish era of Philippine history critically—versions written for the most part by Spaniards and friars. Propagandists questioned the Spanish and friar authors' honesty, motives, methods, and knowledge. They used these histories to write different versions of the same events, characterizing Spanish presence in the Philippines as having destroyed pre-Hispanic Filipino peoples' knowledge, skills, and culture. Overall, as Schumacher has written about Rizal's notes to Mora, they "depict[ed] the advanced state of pre-Hispanic Filipino society and portray[ed] the destructive effects of colonization on that society." Propagandists' accounts of Philippine history, however, also employed a different kind of strategy in questioning Spain's accomplishments and emphasizing native agency; they highlighted exceptional examples of admirable Spanish actions in the islands to highlight, by way of contrast, the present era of injustice and hypocrisy. These histories often appeared, by comparison and example, cautionary and perhaps inspirational tales about the fragility of Spanish sovereignty and the vulnerability of despotic rule. Such cautionary histories—and the threats they contained—appeared, too, in the pages of Las solidaridades, where, for example, Ferdinand Blumenstratt described how Spain lost the Americas. The message was repeated in different ways by different authors and with different characters playing the roles of ruler and people, but the message was consistent: to rule, a power must be with, not against, the people.

Writing the history of the islands after the arrival of the Spaniards involved a different, though related, project from that of reconstructing pre-Hispanic history. As we have seen, Spanish scholars had for the most part not attempted to study the pre-Hispanic Philippines using Orientalist and anthropological data about the islands' present-day peoples; illustrations stepped into this space, using methods and structures of European (but usually not Spanish) scholarship to do so. In contrast, the history of Spanish presence in the Philippines was thoroughly recorded by both historical and contemporary Spanish sources. Yet illustrations used many of the same methods in both projects—recovering pre-Hispanic history and writing about the era of Spanish rule—and in doing so, they reevaluated the data contained in Spanish sources.

Having reconstructed the state of peoples of the Philippines before the Spanish arrived, illustrators authors then critically reinterpreted subsequent history, as recorded in Spanish texts. By referring to the state of affairs before the Spanish had arrived, biases about Spanish-era history could be identified and exposed and data correctly reinterpreted. One way to characterize the method of this illustrators revisioning of Philippine history is, as Schumacher has described Rizal's historical work, "to read once more through Asian eyes the accounts that had come from European pens." In this account of illustrators' method, the Spanish authors' data were to be correctly interpreted in light of their biases and interests. Yet as we will see, illustrators selectively, not consistently, attended to their sources' interests and biases. Illustrators sometimes translated the
terms of political struggle from their sources’ eras into their own in quite
productive, creative, and perhaps misleading ways. The friar chronicles
were products of political struggles of their own times—between dif-
cerent orders, or between Portuguese and Spanish—which were quite
remote from the political struggles of the ilustrados. This distance made
the chronicles’ content available for creative appropriation, an opportu-
nity ilustrados exploited.

The first part of this chapter explores a widely recognized narrative of
pre-Hispanic glory and subsequent decline under Spanish rule, drawing
especially on Rizal’s notes to Morga’s account. I highlight how this nar-
native (1) draws on key Orientalist tropes of civilizational differentiation,
namely law and technology, and (2) critiques contemporary Spanish
administration and rule. Propagandists’ accounts of Philippine history
also employed a different strategy, one less recognized in the histori-
graphy of the ilustrados. As 1 show in the second half of the chapter, their
accounts also emphasized exceptional examples of noble Spanish actions
in the islands, highlighting by way of contrast the present era of injustice
and hypocrisy. By painting the era of Spanish sovereignty in the Phil-
ippines itself as one of early glory and achievement that had since fallen into
a state of decay and decadence, these histories duplicate the contours of
Orientalist accounts of the ancient glory, but subsequent fall and decay, of
Oriental societies. While such a narrative in some times and places served
to legitimate colonial rule, here its political imperatives were more ambigu-
ous. Ilustrados were the (Orientalist) moderns who called for the rescue
of the glories of the past (whether pre-Hispanic or early Spanish) from the
decayed present. These histories walk a fine line between suggesting that
this modern renaissance was compatible with Spanish sovereignty—that
it could blossom within the parameters of a greater Spain—and suggest-
ing that a change of sovereignty would be required. The final section of
the chapter therefore looks at how history was written as a cautionary tale
about the contingency and fragility of Spanish sovereignty in the Philip-
ippines and focuses on de los Reyes’s account of the remarkable rebellion
led by Diego Silang, who nearly succeeded in overthrowing Spanish rule.

Notably absent from these histories is attention to the histories of
Spanish interactions with rulers of peoples and areas that were recogniz-
ably Muslim in the late nineteenth century. Though the works on history
shared methods with the works on “prehistory,” here lies a significant dif-
fERENCE: the works on prehistory (ethnology) emphasized the connections
between contemporary Christian Filipinos and their pagan ancestors’ con-
temporary pagan descendants, but the works that treat the era of Spanish
history distance Christian Filipinos from some of their ancestors’ Mus-
lam politics. This is particularly significant given that rulers of Luso who
appear in early chronicles were Muslim at the moment of the conquest,
and these rulers are sometimes represented in ilustrado and propagandist
histories. The Muslim rulers who had offered significant resistance to the
Spanish more recently, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries on the
peripheries of the archipelago, were left out of the ilustrado rewritings
entirely. Here a major limit of Spanish sovereignty throughout the three
centuries of Spanish rule went without comment: the persistent ability of
many Muslim rulers to either defeat or contain Spanish efforts to claim
sovereignty in their states. Propagandists had no investment in forging alli-
ances with Muslim rulers; on the contrary, they were interested in forging
alliances with secular but Catholic Spaniards. Even to show interest in the
history of Muslim rulers of the Philippines and their success in resisting
Spanish sovereignty might be to suggest a willingness to consider Mus-
lam to be eligible for solidarity. In addition, one of the major themes of
La solidaridad was the service that “Filipino” troops were giving to Span-
ish military campaigns in the South, campaigns directed against Muslim
rulers and peoples. Fighting against the Muslims was one of the qualifica-
tions for Spanishness that La solidaridad touted.

For propagandists and ilustrados, the problem of Muslim peoples in the
Philippines exceeded the immediate tactical context of Spanish battles in
the southern Philippines and Filipo troops’ service to the Spanish cause.
Moro were, as we have seen in chapter 3, an unsettling presence for an idea
of the Filipino people or nation. While pagans could be safely positioned
as ancestors or wards, Muslims were evidence of a competing paternity of
Filipinos that no ilustrado or propagandist was eager to claim, a paternity
shared by the most prominent pre-Hispanic states. “Moro” was, alongside
“Filipino,” a term that could describe unity among peoples. But the terms
were used as if they were mutually exclusive.

Spanish Exploitation and Destruction of the Pre-Hispanic Civilization

In earlier chapters, we have seen how ilustrado authors reconstructed the
features of pre-Hispanic society and history of the Philippines. When Rizal
dedicated "to the Filipinos" his reprinting of and notes to Morga's 1609 account of the early years of Spanish presence in the islands, he wrote that he hoped "to awaken in you the consciousness of our past, erased from memory." His notes attempted to awaken this awareness by calling attention to the parts of Morga's account that described indigenous society as the Spanish encountered it. Rizal also incorporated data from other sources to describe pre-Hispanic society, including friar chronicles, which he critically but selectively revered "to correct that which has been falsified and slandered." The combination of Morga's text with Rizal's footnotes yields a picture of pre-Hispanic society more positive than that of any earlier Spanish accounts.

Other scholars have analyzed how Rizal used his notes to Morga's text to reconstruct the pre-Hispanic Filipinos; and in this respect Rizal's Morga can be considered along with the texts treated in chapters 1 and 3. Reconstructing the past and making this past known to fellow Filipinos was a significant goal and accomplishment of Rizal's work, but he also saw it as a means toward another end, for he wrote of the urgent need "to first make the past known, in order to be able to better judge the present and measure the path traversed during three centuries." Knowledge of the pre-Hispanic past, then, was essential to any kind of informed analysis about Spanish accomplishments and failures, as well as those of the Filipinos they ruled. With this base of knowledge of pre-Hispanic society and an informed evaluation of the history of the Philippines under Spanish rule, "we will all be able to dedicate ourselves to studying the future." Bearing in mind the relationship that Rizal drew in his dedication between the study of the pre-Hispanic Philippines and the study of the Spanish era, we will consider here Rizal's notes to Morga's text less for how they reconstruct pre-Hispanic society than for how they compare that society with what followed under Spanish control. The contrasts that Rizal drew between the pre-Hispanic world and the contemporary Philippines served to critique not only the history of Spain in the Philippines but also the contemporary Philippines under Spain.

The ancient culture that Rizal used Morga to describe had disappeared almost entirely, he wrote, thanks to the efforts of agents of Spanish colonization and their disastrous policies and projects. Contrary to the narrative that the Spanish had brought progress to the backward "people without history" of the Philippines, the narrative of Rizal and other propagandists held instead that Spaniards were the agents of decay. Rizal constructed this narrative of decay by first highlighting and reflecting on achievements of the societies that the Spanish encountered in the Philippines. In his footnotes to Morga's text, Rizal described a pre-Hispanic society with relatively advanced technologies, robust production, and elegant and effective systems of religion, morality, and governance. Overall, as Ambeth Ocampo has put it, "Rizal argued that the pre-Hispanic Filipinos had their own culture before 1565, and thus were not saved from barbarism, and did not acquire 'civilization' or a new religion from Spain. Rizal insists that the flourishing pre-Hispanic Philippine civilization, obliterated by Spain and the friars, could have developed on its own into something great." In comparison with contemporary Filipino society, Rizal wrote, the pre-Hispanic world seemed in many respects to be more noble, harmonious, and advanced. Through these comparisons, Rizal condemned Spanish colonization as having brought not progress, but decline.

In this section, I note especially how Rizal compared institutions of law in the pre-Hispanic Philippines with those of the Spanish Philippines, as well as the state of technology in both eras. Institutions of law—formal and informal, as Rizal conceived of them—were significant as markers of legitimate states and a favorite subject of Orientalists elsewhere; technology, on the other hand, was often taken to be at home in the advanced countries of Europe, a possession of the modern West. Rizal's claims in these areas both used and disrupted Orientalist tropes.

Ancient Filipino morality, Rizal wrote, constituted a set of practices that performed the work of governmental structures and a legal system. This moral system greased the wheels of society without need of large-scale, complex bureaucratic institutions or the codification of law or doctrine in durable written form. Rizal's notes effectively turned what might be considered a liability into a virtue: the pre-Hispanic Philippines lacked textual documentation or large and complex bureaucratic states and religious institutions typically associated with great ancient "Oriental" societies. Ancient texts, in particular those that were seen as the bases of legal systems, were the subject of significant Orientalist research elsewhere. Rizal's notes attended particularly to how ancient moral systems functioned effectively as law and so addressed what might be seen as a deficiency. He further established the ancient civilization's achievements by comparing its characteristics with those of societies that were generally accepted as dignified and even advanced. In those comparisons, ancient Filipino society at least measured up to those standards and often exceeded them.
Rizal reconstructed indigenous legal structures by drawing on Morga's notes about formal institutions of rule but also by defining governing structures more generally in terms of social morals. When Morga described how the indigenous principado, generally translated as "nobility," might form a confederation and choose its leadership, Rizal noted the resemblance between these arrangements and those of "states of the Middle Ages, with their barons, counts, and dukes who chose the best to govern them, or accepted the rule of the most dominant leader." The rules of royal succession in the ancient Philippines were "the same [as those] followed now by royal families of Spain, England, Austria, etc., etc.,” and ancient Filipino society even "outstripped the Europeans" and was "in conformity with natural law" when it came to noblewomen's status; whereas European noblewomen "lose their nobility if they marry with plebeians," their ancient Filipino counterparts did not. Ancient Filipino society had a way of handling robbery that "was like the practices of the Middle Ages" of Europe; but, in terms of divorce laws, it was "more advanced than the modern French and English," for a marriage could be dissolved if "relatives of both parties and the elders agreed." If there were children, however, "out of love for them, [the parents] never separate," and Rizal added caustically that children's presence was "something which by the way does not impede divorce in Europe." Similarly, on the topic of moral systems and punishment, Morga noted that physical injury was more easily forgiven than verbal offense, Rizal exclaimed, "What an elevated idea of moral sensibility the ancient Filipinos must have had; they considered offenses to it more serious than offenses to the body!" European civilizations of that time, and even many now, would never give such weight to it, despite all their pretensions of idealism." The morality of the pre-Hispanic system was a consequence of the ancients' religious beliefs, which, Rizal explained, should not be undervalued. Here again, comparison was used to establish the equivalency and even superiority of ancient Filipino morality to European moral and legal systems, both ancient and modern.

Comparison worked not only to establish the achievements of ancient civilization but also to mitigate what appeared to be its barbarous moments. Pre-Hispanic laws and morals did have their imperfections, Rizal acknowledged, but these had been misunderstood and misrepresented. When Morga described sex out of wedlock and between relatives, Rizal noted that while "[i]t is not impossible that these things may have happened," one had to consider that "similar and even worse cases are recorded in...the annals of the great peoples and families of Christian and devout Europe." Yet it was "probably an exaggeration to say it was common" since even now after more than three centuries, we see Spanish writers saying the most absurd and ridiculous things when it comes to denigrating the Indians. Similarly, in an extended note about the pre-Hispanic system of slavery or indebtedness, Rizal noted that the slavery practiced in the Philippines was different from and more humane than the slaveries of Greece, of Rome, or of Africans in the Americas. Filipinos' conversion to Catholicism, in Rizal's notes, brought cultural amnesia and self-misunderstanding. That conversion also loosened the moral ties that had so effectively held pre-Hispanic society together. Pre-Hispanic society "had no need" for written laws, for example, because "the memory of parents, so sacred and venerable, and the belief that the spirit of the ancestors came to live among their descendents, punishing or protecting them according to their subsequent behavior," meant that inheritance was easily arranged without risk of selfish contestation. In contrast, "since the missionaries convinced the Indians that most of their ancestors roated and burned in Purgatory or Hell," such arrangements would require "notaries, official documents [stamped paper], and litigation and scheming, from now on, forever and ever." The ultimate comparison, at which the others also point, is that between the ancient Filipino society and the contemporary one, as produced in part by Spanish intervention.

Rizal contested what was considered "progress," by affirming the radical difference between the pre-Hispanic and the hispanized Philippines but valuing the former over the latter. The contemporary Philippines also suffered in comparison with the pre-Hispanic past in terms of criminal justice. An ancient method for recovering stolen goods "should not have been lost," he wrote, "but rather, as an anti-Filipino observer notes, the Europeans should have imitated it. Between this so-called 'barbarian practice' and the 'civilized' [practice] that we have now for investigating stolen goods—by means of electrical machines, whips, clamps, and other inquisitorial tortures—there is a great distance." Further, a pre-Hispanic method of determining guilt or innocence in cases of robbery was "injustices," a far cry from the methods of the present day: Rizal noted that a fatar had recently been consulted in a criminal investigation because he was "known as a diviner," and that "hysterical old women, . . . tricksters,
etc." were also routinely consulted, "demonstrating that the intellectual level has fallen greatly: before they reasoned, now they are content with asking and believing. For the enemies of reason, this is called 'progress'!" It is no surprise that Rizal targeted the civil and criminal legal systems of the contemporary Filipinos. These were years in which the civil and criminal codes in the Philippines were contested, and propagandistas had peninsular Spanish allies who were interested in reforming the administration of justice in the islands. Legal systems had been favorite subjects of Orientalist scholars elsewhere, who appealed to the authority of ancient texts, without comparable textual sources, Rizal reconstructed a picture of a noble, well-functioning, and just pre-Hispanic legal system. Unlike many Orientalists elsewhere, Rizal did not suggest the past systems be institutionalized in the present; instead, he used the past to criticize the present.

Laws, religion, and morality were common areas of attention for Orientalists, and this focus contributed to the European idea of Eastern peoples as contemplative and philosophical. In contrast, however, technology was not a classic area of Orientalist attention. Its practical, applied nature can counter to an idea of the contemplative, spiritual, and philosophical. Rizal, however, paid particular attention to evidence of technological development in the pre-Hispanic Philippines. By contrasting the pre-Hispanic era (of relative advance) with his current age (of technological backwardness and incompetence), he pointed the finger of technological inaptitude at the colonizing Spaniards. Before the Spanish had arrived, "the Indies eagerly dedicated themselves to gold mines; not only by panning for gold, but also performing the real work of mining," which required relatively sophisticated engineering. Rizal noted other technological and commercial accomplishments of the ancients in carpentry, metallurgy, shipbuilding, trade, medicine, and weapon design and manufacture. Such technological accomplishments belied the "primitive state" to which Spaniards had supposedly found the natives, and their concrete materiality made them more resilient in the face of skepticism than were the moral accomplishments Rizal also eulogized.

Rizal argued that the relatively advanced knowledge, technology, and industry of the pre-Hispanic Filipinos had been destroyed—along with the healthy economy—in the Spanish era. He noted that Morga described arms that were more beautiful and intricate than those used in his own day, "proof of the backwardness into which present-day Filipinos [atleast Filipinos] have fallen in their industries," and added to Morga's account of indigenous knowledge of herbal medicines and poisons that "today's toxicology in the Philippines is very backward."

Perhaps nowhere was the loss of indigenous technology more keenly felt than with shipbuilding. One of La solidaridad's lead stories had covered a recent scandal, revealing how friars had interfered in the technological and secular world to disastrous ends for the Philippines. A committee in Manila, composed of both friars and those La solidaridad called "prominent citizens," had solicited donations in order to commission a galleon a Hong Kong company to donate to the navy in the Philippines. This went to members of the committee, one of the friars had alerted the plans advanced by the Hong Kong engineers, and the resulting ship was too unstable to leave the port of Hong Kong. When the committee demanded a refund, the Hong Kong company refused, saying that the ship had been constructed according to order. When the committee investigated the claim, it found the meddlesome friar to be the culprit and appealed to the government for help.

Rizal quietly referenced this scandal in a note that he added to a section of Morga that praised the navigational and shipbuilding skills of the ancients. Rizal wrote, "Filipinos... far from progressing, have fallen backwards, since although ships are constructed in the Islands today, we can say that they are almost all of [a] European model. The ships [described by Morga], that contained a hundred oarsmen on each side and thirty combat soldiers, disappeared; the country that once with primitive methods built vessels of almost 4,000 tons now has to run to foreign ports, like Hong Kong, to give gold wrested from the poor in exchange for useless cruisers." Rizal used the comparison to simultaneously highlight the accomplishments of the past and contrast them to the absurdity of the present: "the poor," who were descendants of ancient master shipbuilders, had lost their money extorted in order to pay for an imported substitute for their own forbearers' lost technology, but inappropriate and inept friar meddling rendered even that substitute "useless." Rizal again later lamented the same decline, adding a wry comment to Morga's description of skilled carpenters and shipbuilders: "Comparing all of this with the present state of affairs, it is necessary to converse oneself with the number of [government] employees and friars who swarm [pululan] in the islands, in order not to feel too keenly the backwardness into which we have fallen." The ancient past, as so often was the case in this work, was a foil that highlighted the sorry state of the present.
Emphasizing law and morality on the one hand and technology on the other, Rizal's comparisons of past with present functioned in two important ways. First, they articulated with common Orientalist themes in unusual ways that ennobled the ancient past, despite its textual lacuna. Laws, morality, and religion—the subjects of some of the most ancient ennobling texts elsewhere in the Orient—were figured as having functioned so effectively in practice that written codifications were superfluous. This captured the value of ancient (Oriental) grandeur while eliding the lack of texts (the source of admiration of the ancient Oriental elsewhere). Second, technology—an area usually contrasted in Orientalist scholarship with the more typically "Oriental" accomplishments in the spiritual realms of the philosophical and contemplative—was emphasized as one of the ancient society's strengths. This strength, in contrast with present-day technological weakness, figured Spanish intervention as the source of technological backwardness. These characterizations work to accrue all the positive associations of Orientalism to ancient Filipino society, while displacing negative associations to the Spanish.

However, the picture that Rizal painted of Spanish history in the Philippines was yet more complicated, as we will see shortly. Both Rizal's Morga and de los Reyes's History of Ilocos painted two quite contrasting pictures of Spanish presence in the Philippines. On the one hand, they described how practices of greedy and cruel Spaniards destroyed pre-Hispanic society. On the other hand, they also praised quite highly the actions and nobility of two of Spain's earliest representatives in the islands: Legazpi and his grandson, Juan de Salcedo. This high praise requires explanation and reveals a more complicated narrative of propagandist history: a narrative that criticized some institutions of Spanish colonization, both religious and secular, but also claimed for itself the mantle of a particular kind of Spanish honor. In a more reminiscent of British Orientalists in South Asia, Iliustros painted an earlier glorious Spanish age to which they, not contemporary Spanish institutions, were the heirs.

Villains of Early Spanish Rule:
Encumendos and Other Exploiters

As we have noted, Rizal acknowledged and contextualized pre-Hispanic systems of slavery and indebtedness. In Rizal's analysis, Spaniards had exacerbated those abuses, rather than ending them as was their mandate.

As Rizal wrote in a footnote that accompanied Morga's text on pre-Hispanic slavery, "[a]fter the conquest, the bad became worse. The Spaniards made [people into] slaves without . . . pretext and without the Indies in question being in their jurisdiction, even selling them and removing them from their townships [pueblos] and islands." When Morga wrote that the natives had been tyrannically subjugated to the principality before the arrival of the Spanish, Rizal noted that "[w]e have already shown . . . that in the change of master [señor], the status of Filipino parishes went from bad to worse" and that those who were supposedly freed from slavery by the Spaniards "were later easily enslaved by the Spanish encomendador." The system of encomiendas, along with the galleon trade, was one of the main culprits in what Rizal described as the Spanish-induced economic ruin of the Philippines.

Under the encomienda system, common to Spanish possessions in the Americas and the Philippines, the crown granted a Spanish colonizer (the encomendero) the right to collect tribute (tax) from the locals of a certain area (the encomienda) in supposed exchange for their military protection and education in the faith. In effect, the crown subcontracted the authority it had been granted by Rome. Rizal highlighted the extraordinarily coercive and exploitative nature of this arrangement, noting, for example, that the astounding wealth of a man mentioned by Morga "is not strange, because he was an encomendero," and that "it is well known how quickly many of those encomenderos made themselves extremely rich in few years, leaving colossal fortunes behind upon [their] death." That fortune was accrued from tribute in the form of a combination of cash, kind, and labor, and Rizal quoted from another early chronicle to give a detailed example of such spoils. Exploitation exceeded the bounds of the already exploitative law, for in Rizal's accounts, "some [encomenderos] were not content with tributes . . . but used false measures, [and] balances of a weight twice what was marked, demanding tributes in certain kinds only and setting the price that pleased them." Rizal wryly concluded that the term encomienda "looked on in ironic significance" in the Philippines that was almost opposite from the meaning of the verb from which it was derived. Whereas encomendar meant "to entrust," Rizal wrote that one might better say that land had "been distributed . . . [because] according to how the Encumenderos later behaved themselves, to entrust [encomendar] a province was like saying: to hand it over to someone's pillaging, cruelty, and greed."
De los Reyes similarly attended to "the cruelties, abuses, arbitrary acts, and injustices of the Espanyoles" as "[t]he most important, momentous, and talked-about question" of the history of the Philippines, in his History of Acxas, Volume Two, which covers the history of the region beginning with the arrival of the Spaniards. Comparing the record of ecomoéndos on both sides of the Pacific, de los Reyes noted that "In forty years, the Spanish with their atrocities killed more than fifteen million Americans [indios americanos]," citing the work of Bartolomé de las Casas as an authority and thus aligning himself with the Spanish Dominicans.99 The natives of the Philippines, however, suffered even more than those of the Americas, for "the Spaniards who came to these islands were the worst," and, unlike America, which had great mines to attract ambitious men of means, the Filipinos became a destination "only for criminals that fled persecution by justice, exiles, military deserters, [and] those already dishonored in other parts."100 He explained that sixteenth-century Spaniards "were short of good sentiments, and they learned cruelties in barracks and in ships of war."101 In contrast with Rizal, who had a rich sense of the systematic and institutional character of the problem, de los Reyes blamed these individuals (and their society's) moral failing. He had already mentioned to his reader, however, that he would be able to comment on the problem of the abuses of the ecomoéndos only "as far as official censorship allows."102

While ecomoéndos were the primary agents of the Filipinos' impoverishment, they were not the only institutions that had enriched themselves at the expense of the Filipinos and the Philippines. Friar orders, Rizal wrote, had also exploited the peoples and riches of the Philippines for their own advantage.103 Discussing this, Rizal often made reference to the present, linking his comments to contemporary political struggles to release the grip of the friar orders on the Philippines. Even when the orders were not the subject of Morga's text, Rizal found opportunity to remark in his annotations that "everywhere and in all religions the office of priest has been profitable [productivo]."104 Rizal noted that Morga's description of how the friars' monasteries were supported showed that "already beginning in the first years, the missionary friars had very few opportunities to suffer for the religion."105 On the contrary, friar orders enriched themselves in shady ways; for example, Augustinians had collected rice ostensibly to support themselves, yet the amount was equivalent to "thirteen times more [per friar] than any Indio" consumed.106 Those riches were paralleled by the present-day wealth of the orders. Rizal took the opportunity in his notes to highlight the current real estate wealth of the Dominicans, whose properties included the land that Rizal's family managed and farmed and from which they and the resident laborers (peasants) were evicted after a contentious lawsuit.107 Rizal noted that the Dominican order also had many properties in Hong Kong, where it manages its millions, builds houses continually, conducts business, acquires stocks, etc.108 The historical abuses and injustices of the friar orders were thus occasions to comment on contemporary abuses and injustices.

Rizal's notes showed that the legacy of the ecomoéndos and other extractive institutions was the destruction of pre-Hispanic wealth, industry, and agriculture of the Philippines. In addition to losing skills and technology, Filipinos had purposefully abandoned their mines and destroyed their own industry, seeing that their wealth and goods made them targets for Spanish tribute.109 Forced labor was a major mechanism for this destruction, but it was exacerbated by the forced disarmament of coastal communities, which left them vulnerable to piracy and, by excessive taxation.110 The situation was so appalling, Rizal noted, that a Spaniard had written to his king that "Indios . . . hung themselves, . . . left their wives and children, and, fed up [with their situation], fled to the mountains."111 According to Rizal, even Philip II had noted similar death and destruction, writing that "many hang themselves, and are left to die without food, and others drink poisons. And there were even mothers who killed their children at birth."112 This radical depopulation was another feature of Spanish destruction: great towers had disappeared while, in a contrast that Rizal noted with black humor, the population of friars had grown considerably.113

With such brutal descriptions of Spaniards in the Philippines, it might seem surprising that Rizal or de los Reyes had any kind words for the Spanish at all. Yet in both Rizal’s and de los Reyes’ pieces, the early Spanish figures of Legazpi and Salcedo were portrayed not as dishonorable scoundrels or even as unwarranted invaders. They were praised as heroic, brave, wise leaders, whose example ought to be emulated. Rizal also praised some governmental structures of the early years of Spanish presence, and contrasted them with the much less desirable structures of the present day. These sections painted a different kind of picture of the Spanish history in the Philippines, one in which early moments of worth and reason were replaced by later greed, corruption, and incompetence. This early golden era was a legacy that propagandists themselves could claim to rescue from the decadent present-day Spaniards. Though present-day
Spaniards were in some sense descendents of those earlier noble men, they had betrayed their legacy.

Heroes of Early Spanish Rule: A Golden Age of Spanish Presence
Several propagandist texts painted a picture in which an early era of Spanish valor and dignity in the Philippines had been followed by decay. Though Spaniards were far from perfect in those early years, they were portrayed as having demonstrated at least some integrity that was absent from more recent Spanish administrations, and some were even written of as heroes. The Legazpi of the blood compact was claimed as the valid ancestor not so much of the modern Spanish state but of those seeking moral and respectful Spanish administration in the Philippines. Here, the propagandists appealed to an idea of a noble Spanish history of which they posed themselves as the legitimate heirs, and they called upon the current Spanish administration to live up to the honor of these early rulers.

While emissaries of the crown such as Legazpi had contracted treaties in the earlier years of Spanish presence in the islands, later state agents had not honored them. As Rizal lamented, “If only [the Spaniards] had always conducted themselves according to the letter of those contracts!”

Juan de Salcedo was one of these early Spanish heroes singled out for particular praise by both de los Reyes and Rizal. Born in New Spain, Salcedo arrived in the Philippines in 1567 as a youth of eighteen. De los Reyes wrote that Salcedo had “been distinguished from the beginning by his heroic deeds,” including campaigns in the Visayas (Panay and Mindanao) and Luzon (Zambales, Pangasinan, Batangas, Laguna, Cagayan, and Ilocos). Of particular note, he had, in de los Reyes’s words, secured a “treaty of alliance” with the Illocanos after difficult battles and negotiations, helped lay a diplomatic foundation with local rulers for the founding of Manila in 1571, and had, in Rizal’s words, “saved Manila from Li Mahong [Limahong],” a Chinese pirate who challenged Spanish sovereignty in Luzon for several months beginning in November of 1574. Over a tenth of de los Reyes’s History of Illosos, Volume Two is dedicated to Salcedo’s brief but glorious career in the Philippines, which ended with his death in 1576 at twenty-seven years of age. De los Reyes’s words tended toward the hagiographic when he noted that Salcedo had been a dashing young figure whose accomplishments, bravery, and fairness were unequalled: “Salcedo was lenient with captives and with the natives in general for whom he professed true affection.

...extremely patient in calling for peace, but valiant and forceful in war; his extreme prudence and good tact contrasted greatly with his youthful age.” De los Reyes did not hesitate to call Salcedo the “discoverer” (descubridor) of Illosos as well as of other places in the Philippines, a term that would seem to valorize the Spanish role in first contact, rather than examine it critically. But this characterization makes sense when we consider the particular respect de los Reyes showed for Salcedo and the special relationship of mutual admiration that he claimed this conquistador had with the Illocano people. De los Reyes wrote that Salcedo, “by his valor, unselfishness, generosity and love of the Illocanos, was almost defined by them,” and after his death and burial, locals had disinterred his skull, “certainly not as a trophy, but instead because of the great estimation in which they held such a magnificent and generous man, as they were accustomed to doing in ancient times with notable men.” Salcedo’s magnanimity was evidenced by his having left his inheritance in part to “the natives of his encomienda in Vigan,” as both de los Reyes and Rizal noted, Rizal adding that he was “the only one we know of” who had done such a thing. Rizal called Salcedo a “hero” who “was truly the intelligent arm of Legazpi, [and who] completely won the sympathies of the Filipinos, conquered enemies, and inclined them towards peace and friendship of the Spaniards, by [way of] his cunning, his excellent qualities, his talent and personal valor.” Salcedo was in both propagandists’ accounts a heroic example of Spanish integrity, in contrast with which contemporaries’ venality became more visible. While a few early Spaniards were treated as heroic individuals in propagandist histories, more generally, those texts emphasized that the early years of Spanish rule had better institutional structures than later years did: governors were held accountable for their actions through procedures that were later abandoned. By emphasizing the relative impartiality of those early structures, they drew a contrast with the present day in which government posts were opportunities for personal enrichment, with little risk of being held accountable so long as one stayed on the right side of the powerful friar orders. When Moraga described how officials had been annually reviewed by the high court as a matter of practice, Rizal noted that “[t]his good custom has been completely lost.” In the early days of Spanish colonization, even governors-general were not immune: at the end of their term they, too, were subject to a review called the residencia and were held responsible for their actions if they were judged to have abused their powers. Rizal told his readers to “[c]onsider how strictly governors were...
held accountable then. Some were imprisoned in Manila, one of whom... spent five years [imprisoned] in Fort Santiago.* In contrast, “this sacred Residence [formal review] has [now] been lost; now no one is held strictly accountable for their conduct.”*5 Juxtaposed to present-day arbitrary rule, the residence of early years was a model of Spanish accountability.

Propagandist histories also favorably contrasted other policies and practices of early Spanish administration with those of the present day. Rizal gave examples of such lost practices: military service was often considered grounds for exemption from tribute; Cebu was founded “with all the rights and privileges of Spanish political communities”; and a Jesuit had been sent to Spain to represent the Philippines whose mission “was similar to that of a deputy today, having, however, more importance, since he went on to be a kind of Advisor or representative close to the absolute Monarch of that era. Why was it possible to have a representative of the Philippines in that age and not now?”*6 In the early days of Spanish colonization, Rizal noted, Morga described elections in which every married native could vote, whereas “now, no longer do all Natives [Nativas] vote... The resident [seine] has lost his right to elect his leader.”*7 Here, Rizal invoked the struggles of propagandists in Madrid to win representation and other citizenship rights for Filipinos, citing precedent in the history of Spanish administration. In short, Rizal took every opportunity to note the passages of Morga’s text that described a government practice of the early years of Spanish administration that was better than current practices, especially noting when he found precedent for the rights and privileges for Filipinos that the propagandists advocated.

These narratives that praised early Spanish actions in the Philippines may seem counter to the harsh criticism that we have already considered of the Spanish era as a whole and of encomendero in particular. We can see that they worked complementarily, however, if we keep in mind their function as propaganda, in the best sense: to enlighten, to motivate, to educate. Such historical narratives might speak simultaneously to Spaniard and Filipino, calling on each to take up the cause of right and reason in the contemporary Philippines, a cause that claimed both indigenous and Spanish patrimony.

Instructive and Cautionary History

When illustrative histories lauded what Filipinos had accomplished despite Spanish incompetence and greed, they functioned not only to inspire
events belied, the hardworking Ilocanos were shown to have sustained a healthy economy.

Spanish vulnerability and Filipino strength were underlined by both Rizal and de los Reyes when they noted that impressive Spanish military forces were often not, strictly speaking, Spanish. Where Morga mentioned how the Spanish monarchy had discovered and conquered remote parts of the world with Spanish armadas (navies) and people, Rizal included a note reminding the reader, “And we can add Portuguese, Italian, French, Greek, and even African and Oceania, since the expeditions captained by Columbus and Magellan (the one Genoese and the other Portuguese) and others after them, though they were Spanish armadas, were nevertheless composed of different nationalities, and among them there were Blacks, Mahajans and even people from the Philippines and Marianas.”

Rizal found similar opportunities in Morga’s references to Spanish victories in the Philippines, pointing out in one case that though Morga referred to a force of nine hundred “Spaniards,” that force must have consisted in part of Filipinos. De los Reyes, too, pointed out that the “Spanish” victories relied on native strength. Always the Ilocano patriot, he noted that while historians rightly gave credit to Salcedo for having saved Manila from Li-Mahong, that credit belonged not exclusively to him: “undoubtedly Ilocanos also have a share in the glory of having saved the city of Manila,” for Salcedo fought with Ilocano soldiers. Such praise for native soldiers’ military contributions to Spain’s campaigns in the islands echoed claims being made in Le solidaridad that Filipino soldiers were demonstrating their patriotism in military campaigns in the south. These claims implied that Spanish sovereignty in the islands was conditional and dependent: if it was Filipinos who gained and held the islands for Spain, then without their cooperation the islands might be lost.

Some of the most notable examples of cautionary history come in Rizal’s Morga. As we have seen, when Rizal wrote about pre-Hispanic slavery, he generally mitigated what he thought was likely to be an overly negative perception of it by comparing it favorably with other kinds of slavery and with the encomiendas that the Spanish brought. But in one section, he wrote quite strikingly of this slavery in terms of it being a burdensome “yoke” and “tyranny”:

Thanks to the social condition and number [of slaves] in that time, Spanish domination encountered such little resistance, and the principales filipinos [Filipino nobility or elite] easily lost their independence and liberty; the people, accustomed to the yoke, neither went to defend them from the invader nor went to fight for liberty; that they had never enjoyed; for the people, it was a change of masters; the nobles, accustomed to tyrannizing by force, were obliged to accept the foreign tyranny, when it appeared more powerful than theirs, and finding neither love nor feelings of rebellion among the enslaved masses, they found themselves without arms and without strength.99

The bloodless victories of the Spanish, Rizal argued, were a result of neither benevolent terms offered by the Spanish nor a lack of valor, pride, or military capability among Filipinos. Instead, Spanish victories were quantitatively because pre-Hispanic Filipino masses were oppressed by their rulers and so not inclined to fight against their rulers’ enemies. Rizal more commonly extolled the virtues of pre-Hispanic society than he dwelt on its injustices. He pointed to this history of injustice and overthrow, however, as a displaced cautionary tale for contemporary tyrannical rulers: you may keep the Philippines with the consent of Filipinos, but if the masses turn against you under the leadership of another you will lose the islands. The same cautionary tale might have another message for those under the tyrant’s rule: this tyrant may fall to a challenger if you withhold your support, but beware the tyrant that follows.

Rizal underscored the contingency of Spanish sovereignty and the inevitability of the destiny that awaited it should it continue down the path of injustice, continuing:

Between a people with a tyrannical aristocracy and another with an unbridled democracy, there are well-balanced peoples. The one and the other easily fall under the domination of the first foreign invader, the first because of weakness and the second because of anarchy. Many of the colonies that are retained thanks to a systematic brutalization of the inhabitants by one class, caste, or race that surrounds itself with glittery, substance-less prestige, and that to maintain itself, has to defend itself absurdly in order to be consistent with a false principle, will without doubt end somewhat like the tyrannized peoples, like Persia, India, etc., succumbing before the first foreigner.”
Rizal prophesied the end of unjust colonial rule not because of the particular strength of the Filipino people who would rise up against it but because tyranny was inherently weak, vulnerable to another's usurpation. Such rule would, "like Persia, India, etc." be overthrown by another empire's challenge; the Spanish Philippines had become like a decadent Oriental despotism. In his notes to Morga's text, then, Rizal implied that history predicted Spain's likely fall should she continue to obstruct rather than assist the Philippines in the path of progress.

In contrast, de los Reyes's Historia de Ilocos presented a cautionary history that focused on how the institutions of the Spanish state were vulnerable to those supposedly ruled by it, rather than vulnerable to foreign powers. The most remarkable section of the work, and perhaps the most remarkable example of cautionary history in propagandist writings, is a long and vivid story of the rise and fall of Diego Silang. In de los Reyes's account, Silang was a politically astute, strategically deft, and courageous leader who took advantage of the crisis of authority surrounding the British attack on Spanish sovereignty in the Philippines in 1766, part of the worldwide conflagation that was to usher in the era of British ascendancy. In de los Reyes's telling, Silang was a patriot both of Ilocos and of the Philippines, more broadly, who had two overarching objectives. First, he aimed to drive both British and Spanish forces from the archipelago by playing each off the other and uniting the people. No less ambitiously, he also aimed to bring about a full-scale clan revolution in the Philippines, liberating the lower classes from their principalia. For de los Reyes, this was neither a simple modern peasant insurrection, nor an effort to restore traditional authority from invading usurpers, nor the work of a power-hungry messianic leader; it was nothing short of a complete modern and anticolonial revolution, grounded in principles of freedom and liberty.

In presenting de los Reyes's account, my point, as elsewhere, is neither to affirm nor to dispute its veracity but to show what kinds of political meanings it produced. Why might de los Reyes have dwelt on the revolt led by Silang? First and foremost, it was a story of rebellion against Spanish sovereignty in the modern age that was, at least in de los Reyes's telling, reasonably close to being successful. This rebellion was made possible by English aggression, and so the story served as an instructive lesson in how two European powers—one the established sovereign and the other the aggressor—could be played off each other by a local leader. Second, as Silang reminded his forces and de los Reyes reminded his readers, Spanish sovereignty depended on the peoples' cooperation, and "if we unite ourselves as brothers, the Spanish could do nothing against us." Third, while the rebellion ultimately faltered because of what de los Reyes called los canos' "fanatical" Catholicism and respect for the Church, de los Reyes emphasized the initial success that Silang had in mobilizing his rebel forces against the parish priests and church authorities. Fourth, similar to how Silang managed to rally forces that were fervently Catholic against the Catholic authorities, Silang also successfully usurped Spanish government authorities while claiming to defend the Spanish cause. De los Reyes's telling of these events highlighted the conditions that favored the rebellion: the numerical superiority of the Ilocanos united against the Spanish and the power of appeals to freedom and justice among people living in a condition that resembled serfdom. At the same time, de los Reyes emphasized Silang's ability both to exploit those advantages and strategically to overcome his disadvantages: his forces in this struggle against Spain were drawn from among people whose zealous faith had led them to hold the clergy and church officials in high regard, while the Spanish and English forces had the considerable weight of well-established military states behind them. Overall, the story presented not just a series of illustrative lessons in political strategy but an exercise for the political imagination in which the reader was invited to imagine the possibilities of what had been, what might have been, and what might yet be.

Briefly and broadly, the story's events as de los Reyes related them can be outlined thus: In 1766, when British forces had seized Manila from the Spanish, Diego Silang called for the people of Vigan to gather together to defend the Catholic faith and Spanish sovereignty against local Spanish civil authorities who, he claimed, were ready to surrender to the British. The British, meanwhile, sought local support by promising tax relief to peasants. Silang successfully scared off the local civil authority, demanding two things of the Catholic authorities (the prelate) in return for handing him power: (1) that he proclaim his support for Silang's supporters' actions (against the Spanish civil authorities) and (2) that he concede the tax relief that the British had promised those who would rebel against the Spanish. When the prelate refused, Silang's supporters moved against the clergy as a whole, still in the name of defending the Spanish cause and faith against the threatening English. This set off a confrontation between men mobilized by Silang and others mobilized by a Catholic authority (the prelate), in which the latter eventually prevailed but only after the former had briefly
effectively taken over Vigan, raised more forces by appealing to the down-
trodden to rise against their oppressors, and for a while maintained an
effective defense against the Catholic authorities’ forces. Silang had also
appealed to the British for aid, from whence arose accusations that he had
acted against the Spanish and in the aid of the British.

De los Reyes began his telling of Silang’s story by putting it in the con-
text of English attacks on Spanish sovereignty in the Philippines and why
he judged to be the feeble response of many Spanish officials. De los Reyes
noted that when the British attacked Manila, “the indios demonstrated
heroism,” such that the English, recognizing that indios “were the most
formidable defenders of the Spanish cause,” sought to curry favor with
them. The Spanish, on the other hand, were not so patriotic or valiant.
Pointedly quoting the Spanish Jesuit source, de los Reyes noted that, “as
Father Baranero says,” Spanish leaders, who “were in collusion with the
English, ordered the indios who had fought so valiantly...[to go back] to
their towns.” Having sent the valorous indios away from their defense
of Manila, Spanish authorities were not to be trusted in defending the
Spanish cause, for “history demonstrates that many Spanish leaders did
not act very loyally towards their own patria during the English invasion,
which made the English think that the Spaniards they encountered in the
Philippines were not Spaniards from Spain,” an assessment de los Reyes
attributed to Spanish author Simbald de Mas.27

In this context, de los Reyes told his readers, Silang presented himself
as the true defender of Spain, against the governor (alcaldé) of Vigan who
Silang claimed was planning to surrender to the English. And though the
governor never got the chance to prove or disprove this assertion, because
Silang seized power, de los Reyes noted that once the governor ceded
power to Silang, he “led the provincias.”28 Against this background of Span-
ish cowardice, de los Reyes wrote, it became understandable that Silang
could portray himself “as a defender of the Spanish cause.”29 However,
Silang’s true goal was not to defend Spain, nor to work for the English, as he
at one time claimed and as many Spanish authors adjudged; rather, for de
los Reyes, Silang was an autonomista [autonomist] who wanted “the inde-
pendence of Ilusco,” or, as he later and more broadly asserted, “to throw
the English and Spanish out of the Philippines.”30 And while de los Reyes
marked these aims as Silang’s, he also conjured the specter of such a move-
ment being repeated. Silang and the purported bid for independence stood
as an example, perhaps not to be emulated, but at least to be contemplated.

De los Reyes’s telling of the story focused on the actions of Silang,
making a full and admirable character out of a rather thin historical record.
Silang was a heroic individual, “on the whole, one of the most important
genres that stand out in Philippine records,” a “gigantic figure,” “intelligent,
dedicated, courageous.”31 No individual ever effectively challenged Silang.
Instead, it was the weight of the combined forces against him, aided by
fortune, which led to his downfall. Silang had a great talent and singular political sagacity. The [Catholic]
Religion was professed almost to the point of fanaticism by the
Ilocanos and proof of this was that they did not dare to kill the pari-
sh priest, and because of excommunication they finally lost their
enthusiasm for serving Silang; and notwithstanding, the latter had
succeeded in taking the Bishop and the parish priests prisoner. The
same Silang knew that the Ilocanos feared the Spanish govern-
ment very much, and were enemies of risks and change; however,
the rebel leader succeeded in shaking off the yoke of the Span-
iards, initially using the leverage of the most influential Spaniards
themselves... The great Filipino politician succeeded in mastering his most
fearful and powerful enemies: the fanaticism and timidity of the locals... and the influence of the Religious and the Spanish.32

Thus the power of the Spanish was not due to Spanish forces or the cler-
gy but the “fanatical” Catholic faith of the Ilocanos. The true battle was
between Silang, the sole individual historical agent, and the influence that
European institutions had on the Ilocanos. This challenge Silang met with
ingenious skill of manipulation: in de los Reyes’s description, Silang skill-
fully used the people’s faith against both Spanish state and church forces.
In de los Reyes’s telling, however, Silang also aimed at a total politi-
cal and social revolution, because he struggled against “the power of the
principales.”33 Silang’s true goals, de los Reyes speculated, probably
included that of “liberating...the plebe from the hateful tyranny of the
bukubukan (indigenous principales).”34 Silang conducted his campaign for
a revolution, understanding “that the social constitution had to be com-
pletely transformed,” and he endeavored “to raise the kailoems (the lower
class) against the bukubukan (principales).”35 This complete social revolu-
tion required not only military prowess on the part of Silang but also the
ability to educate the people so that they would see their own true position in the social order.

Part of Sillang’s brilliance, in de los Reyes’ telling, is that he was able to prepare the minds of the people for this true revolution, educating the people and calling them to action at the same time; he was, in this sense, a true propagandist. To this end, “[t]he envy of Sillang preached democratic ideas, and they said that the principales enriched themselves at the expense of the poor whom they oppressed with illegal levies, usurious loans and fraud, which was true.” Sillang issued a decree in which he promised “to liberate . . . the people from the heavy yoke of the principales . . . firmly telling the principales that the death knell had sounded for their privileges and abuses. . . . And finally, he invited the disenfranchised people [pueblo bajo] to appoint a local leader from among the common class [clase popular], that would guarantee their liberties.” In evaluating the overall successes of Sillang, despite his eventual fall, de los Reyes noted that “[t]he indigenous principales always, even now (and more so, earlier), have held the inferior classes as slaves; and notwithstanding, Sillang, accomplishing earlier what would be repeated much later in the great French Revolution, succeeded in raising the people against their oppressors: the indigenous principales.” Sillang was a liberator ahead of his time; and, according to de los Reyes, “his deeds seem to be inspired by the theories of Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot and other philosophers [filósofos] that later would produce the events of the Paris Commune.”

According to de los Reyes, then, in this hero’s aims were entwined nothing less than anticolonial revolution and class revolution, anticipating both American and French revolutions. Sillang’s biggest obstacles were the people’s attachment to the very forms of influence that he was trying to dislodge—the Spanish and the principales—and their fervent faith, which prevented them from acting against agents of the Catholic Church. In other words, as de los Reyes judged it, the radical aims of Sillang were ultimately frustrated by the people’s lack of ideological preparation, a preparation that de los Reyes himself, with his writings, sought to provide. Sillang’s story, then, was illustrative and enlightening both as a lesson in what needed to be done (prepare the minds of the people) and as a lesson in how a leader might strategically accomplish his own aims, with the aid of the people whom he rallied despite their antagonisms to his true aims. Leadership, in other words, might require strategic duplicity. This extraordinary story was laid in the pages of a book on history. It is perhaps the boldest example of cautionary history in propagandist writings.

Conclusion: Nationalism and Exclusive History

Historians and ethnologists drew textual data about pre-Hispanic culture and history in the Philippines from sixteenth- and seventeenth-century accounts, many produced by or based on reports of missionaries. These accounts were often written for a royal or papal audience—that is, they were written to report back to ecclesiastic and royal officials who would determine the policy of church and crown in the East. Though illustrados often emphasized the bias against Philippine indigenous in these accounts, Scott has suggested that “missionary reports intended for European audiences are often distorted by the desire to prevent converts from appearing like naked savages.” Some of these chronicle sources were produced in political circumstances and for political ends that shaped the content of their message; that content then became available and useful for authors who centuries later had a different kind of political interest in the subject. As Juan-Pau Rubíes has argued, these accounts were produced under some “peculiar” conditions. These particular conditions were partially responsible for the contours that would make the accounts attractive sources for illustrados’ rewritings of Spanish history.

Rubíes shows that most of the chronicle sources were produced during a period of intensified political conflicts among Spanish and Catholic forces in Asia and that those struggles in turn shaped the chronicles’ narratives. For example, Dominicans and Franciscans challenged Jesuit missionary monopoly in China and Japan; this conflict shaped what is referred to as the “Chinese rights controversy,” which pitted Jesuits against their Dominican and Franciscan adversaries who claimed they were too tolerant of local heretical Chinese practices. That controversy was political as much as it was theological. The resulting accounts shaped by those controversies “could at times be well informed . . . but violent theological polemics totally unbalanced the image of China they transmitted to Spain and Europe.” A related and complicating political factor around the same period was that the Castilian and Portuguese crowns were temporarily joined (1580–

1640), though their imperial institutions remained distinct. Distinct enmities, and contention between Castilian and Portuguese dominions and agents complicated analyses of “Spanish” and Catholic projects in the
Philippines and elsewhere in the region.\textsuperscript{19} Not coincidentally, the same period—the late sixteenth through mid-seventeenth centuries—brought the earliest major European-language textual sources for studying pre-Hispanic and contact-era societies in the Philippines.

Those early sources, then, were produced of and through political contestations, and their accounts of the early years of Spanish presence in the Philippines were necessarily colored by their authors’ structural positions: whether they were members of one of the competing church institutions of the Jesuits, Dominicans, or Franciscans, or whether they were of the competing institutions of the Spanish or Portuguese crowns (who might in turn be either allied with or opposed to the Jesuits, Dominicans, or Franciscans on any given policy or project). In these circumstances, the significant political antagonisms were not thought to be Spanish versus Filipino or Catholic versus pagan, but instead Castilian versus Portuguese, Jesuit versus Dominican, or Jesuit versus Franciscan.\textsuperscript{20} With these the axes of contestation, a text’s subtext could be about the Jesuits, in comparison to the work of the Dominicans or Franciscans, for example; or it could be a Castilian-based institutional effort, in comparison with Portuguese-based ones.

\textit{Ilustrado} histories largely obscured the particular conditions under which these early sources were produced, and that work of obscuring produced more powerful meaning. In other words, though \textit{ilustrado} histories are revisions of earlier (Spanish) royal and (Catholic) ecclesiastical accounts, the revisions do not simply challenge the veracity of those early Spanish accounts or mine them for data that could be stripped of bias. They do both of these things, but they also make use of the value judgments contained in those works that were more complementary to native society and critical of friar orders. Positive value judgments became all the more notable in \textit{ilustrado} accounts precisely because \textit{ilustrado} authors could presume that their own readers will think that the “Spanish” or “Catholic” chroniclers would be predisposed to view native society critically. Conversely, critical comments about any of the specific friar orders were taken as general evidence of friar orders’ greed and corruption, rather than as artifacts of an intra-Church squabble.

Such appropriations were productive, exactly because they avoided specifying what kind of history was being appropriated. The complexities of the political struggles that produced friar chronicles—complexities of which the \textit{ilustrados} were likely at least aware, given contemporary intra-Church struggles in the Philippines—melted away in their accounts, but the language left behind, language of judgment (whether praise or condemnation), became redeployed with different political actors. While history’s textual sources were available in this particular way for propagandist work, selective recontextualization of textual sources was hardly specific to history in particular as a genre. The bulk of this chapter has focused not on the unique methods or data of the discipline of history but instead on how the propagandists’ historical writings relied on the kinds of methods, data, and assumptions that we have seen at work in ethnology, folklore, and linguistics.

As we have seen, \textit{ilustrado} and propagandist histories focused on narratives that emphasized two eras of the distant past as models of an ethical racial state, models that needed updating but whose intrinsic values needed to be recognized by the present in order to reinvigorate and renew its future: a pre-Hispanic era, on the one hand, and an early Spanish-Catholic era, on the other. The pre-Hispanic era was constructed in part with the aid of Orientalist and anthropological methods, as earlier chapters have considered. The account of the early Spanish-Catholic era, however, employed Orientalism in a different sense: it reproduced the contours of some Orientalist accounts of great ancient pasts in need of rescue from lesser present-day descendents. In the case of de los Reyes’s Silang, a more recent historical event was rendered as fully modern and, despite ambiguous evidence, as a moment that aimed for complete political independence from Spain. Silang presented a model of a modern, rational leader who strategically used his knowledge of the peoples’ less-rational loyalties and proclivities to pursue his aims, including their liberation. In de los Reyes’s hands, in particular, history became (again) an opportunity to critique the present.

These propagandist histories, then, were based on varied models and pointed toward quite distinct possible futures. They articulated future possibilities that would reclaim the ethical glories of pasts. If in many of those futures Spanish sovereignty remained possible, it was always figured as insecure, reinforcing the message that Spanish presence in the islands continued by the grace of the people.
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the masses as opposed to the elite nationalist movement of the propagan-
distas. Glen May (Battle for Batangas [New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press,
1941]) disputes this, using evidence from Batangas to assert that support for the
Revolution was strong among local elites and that the evidence is unclear about
enthusiasm from below. Anderson (Under Three Flags) emphasizes the distinction
between Katipunan and illustrative projects, though he notes evidence that might be
helpful in tracing connections between them.
86. The fact that the Katipunan adopted the "k" requires explanation, since the
letter had only recently been introduced and had quickly disappeared from public
use. Though further research is needed to confirm this, my best guess is that Deo-
dato Arellano, one of the Katipunan’s founding members, was one of the links
between the elite project of orthographic reform and the plebian society. Are-
llano, in whose house the first Katipunan meeting took place, was also a member of
the Liga Filipina (an organization formed by Jose Rizal), the brother-in-law of
del Pilar (editor of La solidaridad), and part of the propagandist network of sup-
porters in the Philippines. Arellano had been initiated into masony by Lopez
Jaen in 1890. See Agoncillo, Rolloff of the Maguys, 37-49; Reynaldo S. Pajardo, The
Brothers: Masons in the Struggle for Philippine Independence (Hong Kong: Enrique
L. Locoin and the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the Philippines,
1988), 49-54; and Schumacher, Propaganda Movement, 135-134.
87. I thank Ben Anderson for drawing my attention to this aspect of the
orthography.
88. Wolff, "The Influence of Spanish on Tagalog.
89. "Kastilang" today takes the more general meaning of "Spanish."
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